Draft version September 28, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1609.07173v2 [physics.space-ph] 27 Sep 2016

MHD-KINETIC TRANSITION IN IMBALANCED ALFVÉNIC TURBULENCE

Yuriy Voitenko and Johan De Keyser
Solar-Terrestrial Centre of Excellence, BIRA-IASB,
Ringlaan-3-Avenue Circulaire, B-1180 Brussels, Belgium
Draft version September 28, 2016

ABSTRACT

Alfvénic turbulence in space is usually imbalanced: amplitudes of waves propagating parallel and anti-parallel to the mean magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_0$ are unequal. It is commonly accepted that the turbulence is driven by (counter-) collisions between these counter-propagating wave fractions. Contrary to this, we found a new ion-scale dynamical range of the turbulence established by (co-) collisions among waves co-propagating in the same direction along $\mathbf{B}_0$. The turbulent cascade is accelerated there and power spectra are steep and non-universal. The spectral indexes vary around -3 (-4) in the strong (weak) turbulence, such that steeper spectra follow larger imbalances. Intermittency steepens spectra further, up to -3.7 (-4.5). Our theoretical predictions are compatible with steep variable spectra observed in the solar wind at ion kinetic scales.
Subject headings: turbulence — waves — solar wind

1. INTRODUCTION

Theory of strong Alfvénic turbulence (Goldreih and Sridhar 1995) predicts that the turbulence cascades anisotropically, mainly toward large perpendicular wavenumbers $k_\perp$ (small perpendicular scales $\lambda_\perp = 2\pi/k_\perp$) across the mean magnetic field, $\mathbf{k}_\perp \perp \mathbf{B}_0$. This prediction has been supported by observations of the solar-wind turbulence (MacBride & Smith 2008, and references therein). With growing $k_\perp$ the turbulent fluctuations become highly anisotropic, $k_\perp \gg k_z$ ($\mathbf{z} \parallel \mathbf{B}_0$), and their perpendicular scales approach the ion gyroradius ρ_i. In this wavenumber range MHD Alfvén waves (AWs) transform into kinetic Alfvén waves (KAWs) (Hasegawa & Chen 1976).

Nonlinear KAW interactions differ significantly from nonlinear AW interactions and produce different turbulent spectra (Voitenko 1998a,b; Schekochihin et al. 2009; Voitenko and De Keyser 2011, Boldyrev and Perez 2012, and references therein). Consequently, at certain sufficiently large wavenumber $k_\perp = k_{\perp *}$ the ion-scale spectral break should occur where the MHD AW turbulence transforms into the KAW turbulence. Recent observations of the solar wind turbulence at ion kinetic scales support this scenario (He et al. 2012, Salem et al. 2012, Podesta 2013, Bruno et al. 2014, Roberts et al. 2015). KAW turbulence linked to MHD sources can develop also in solar (Zhao et al. 2013), terrestrial (Moya et al. 2015, Stawarz et al. 2015), and Jovian (von Papen et al. 2014) magnetospheres.

Theories of Alfvénic turbulence are relatively well developed in asymptotic MHD ($k_\perp^2\rho_i^2 \ll 1$) and kinetic ($k_\perp^2\rho_i^2 \gg 1$) ranges with perpendicular wavenumber spectra $\sim k_\perp^{-5/3}$ (or $\sim k_\perp^{-3/2}$) and $\sim k_\perp^{-7/3}$, respectively (Goldreih and Sridhar 1995, Gogoberidze 2007, Schekochihin et al. 2009, and references therein). The reference cross-field scale separating MHD and kinetic ranges is the ion gyroradius, $1/k_{\perp *} \sim \rho_i$, because finite-$k_\perp\rho_i$ effects distinguish KAWs from AWs. However, there is debate on the nature of ion-scale spectral break $k_{\perp *}$ and steep spectra at $k_\perp > k_{\perp *}$. Ion gyroradius ρ_i, ion inertial length δ_i, plasma β, turbulence amplitude B/B_0, turbulence anisotropy $k_{\perp *}/k_{z*}$, and several their combinations have been suggested as relevant parameters fixing $k_{\perp *}$ (Markovskii et al. 2007, Chen et al. 2014, Boldyrev et al. 2015).

Solar-wind turbulence is imbalanced - amplitudes of waves propagating from the Sun $B_{k(+)}$ are usually larger than amplitudes of sunward waves $B_{k(-)}$ (e.g. Yang et al. 2016, and references therein). A common theoretical assumption is that collisions between these counter-propagating Alfvén wave fractions generate turbulence (Howes & Nielson 2014, and references therein). In this Letter we show that collisions among co-propagating waves (co-collisions thereafter) are stronger than counter-collisions and establish a new dynamical range $k_{\perp *} < k_\perp < 1/\rho_i$ with steep spectra.

2. MODEL AND BASIC RELATIONS

Nonlinear dynamic equation for Alfvén wave amplitudes, including both counter- and co-collisions of waves, has been derived by Voitenko (1998a). Here we construct a semi-phenomenological model for the strong imbalanced Alfvénic turbulence from MHD to kinetic scales using the following approximation for the nonlinear interaction rate at scale $k_\perp$:

$$\gamma^{\rm NL}_{k(\pm)} = \frac{2+s}{4\pi} k_\perp V_A \Delta_{k,s} \frac{B_{k(\pm s)}}{B_0}, \qquad (1)$$

where the wave velocity mismatch $\delta V_{ks}/V_A \equiv \Delta_{k,s} = \sqrt{1+(k_\perp\rho_T)^2} - s$ and magnetic amplitude $B_{k(\pm s)} = B_{k(\pm)}$ for co-collisions ($s = 1$) and $B_{k(\pm s)} = B_{k(\mp)}$ for counter-collisions ($s = -1$). (1) is obtained from equation (6.3) by Voitenko (1998a) assuming local interactions and separating dominant (+) and sub-dominant (-) waves propagating in opposite directions along $\mathbf{B}_0 \parallel \mathbf{z}$. Other definitions are: $\rho_T^2 \simeq (3/4 + T_{ez}/T_{i\perp})\,\rho_i^2$ at $k_\perp\rho_i < 1$ and $\rho_T^2 \simeq (1 + T_{ez}/T_{i\perp})\,\rho_i^2$ at $k_\perp\rho_i > 1$, T_{ez} - parallel electron temperature, $T_{i\perp}$- perpendicular ion temperature, $\rho_i = V_{Ti}/\Omega_i$ - ion gyroradius, Ω_i - ion

gyrofrequency, $V_{Ti}=\sqrt{T_{i\perp}/m_i}$ - ion thermal velocity, $V_A=B_0/\sqrt{4\pi n m_i}$ - Alfvén velocity.

The key factor in (1) that distinguishes co- and counter-collisions is $\Delta_{k,s}$. Co-collisions ($s=1$) exist only for finite $k_\perp\rho_T\neq 0$ making $\Delta_{k,s}\neq 0$. Counter-collisions ($s=-1$) operate throughout, $\Delta_{k,s}\geq 2$ for $k_\perp\rho_T\geq 0$.

At $k_\perp\rho_T<1$ (1) reduces to

$$\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\uparrow\uparrow)}_{k(\pm)}=\frac{1}{2\pi}\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2 k_\perp V_A\frac{B_{k(\pm)}}{B_0}, \tag{2}$$

for co-collisions (superscript $\uparrow\uparrow$), and

$$\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\uparrow\downarrow)}_{k(\pm)}=\frac{1}{2\pi}k_\perp V_A\frac{B_{k(\mp)}}{B_0}. \tag{3}$$

for counter-collisions (superscript $\uparrow\downarrow$).

In the strongly dispersive range (SDR) $k_\perp\rho_T>1$ (1) gives

$$\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\uparrow\downarrow)}_{k+}\approx\frac{1}{3}\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\uparrow\uparrow)}_{k+}\approx\frac{1}{2\pi}\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)k_\perp V_A\frac{B_{k-}}{B_0},$$

i.e. co-collisions and counter-collisions produce the same scalings.

3. MHD-KINETIC TRANSITION AND SPECTRA

In the asymptotic $k_\perp\rho_T\to 0$ MHD limit, $\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}\uparrow\downarrow}_{k(\pm)}>\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\uparrow\uparrow)}_{k(\pm)}\to 0$. In this limit evolution of forward waves $B_{k(+)}$ is driven by backward waves $B_{k(-)}$, and vice verso, in compliance with Goldreih & Sridhar (1995) and many others. Let us start with imbalanced MHD turbulence described by Lithwick et al. (2007), where the cascade times in both (+) and (-) components are defined by (3), $\tau^{\mathrm{TC}(\pm)}_{k\uparrow\downarrow}\sim\tau^{\mathrm{NL}(\pm)}_{k\uparrow\downarrow}\sim 1/\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\pm)}_{k\uparrow\downarrow}$. The co-collision interaction rate (2) increases with $k_\perp$ faster than (3), and the transition occurs at

$$k_{\perp *}\simeq\rho_T^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{B_{k*(-)}}{B_{k*(+)}}} \tag{4}$$

where they become equal. The MHD-type spectral transport driven by counter-collisions is faster at $k_\perp<k_{\perp *}$, but above $k_{\perp *}$ kinetic-type co-collisions dominate. As the turbulence imbalance shifts $k_{\perp *}$ well below $1/\rho_i$, a new dynamical range arises at $k_{\perp *}<k_\perp<1/\rho_i$, in the weakly dispersive KAW range (WDR). For (-) waves the counter-collisions are more efficient at all $k_\perp$.

3.1. *Scaling relations*

In the strong turbulence energy fluxes $\epsilon_{(\pm)}=\left(\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\pm)}_{k\uparrow\downarrow}+\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}(\pm)}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\right)B^2_{k(\pm)}/\left(4\pi\right)$ can be presented as

$$\epsilon_{(\pm)}\approx\frac{B_0^2}{4\pi}\frac{k_\perp V_A}{4\pi}q_k\left(\frac{B_{k(\mp)}}{B_{k(\pm)}}+p_k\right)\left(\frac{B_{k(\pm)}}{B_0}\right)^3, \tag{5}$$

where $q_k=\Delta_{k,-1}$ and $p_k=3\Delta_{k,1}/\Delta_{k,-1}$ are regular growing functions of $k_\perp$. Using (5) we express the fluxes ratio as

$$\frac{\epsilon_{(-)}}{\epsilon_{(+)}}=\frac{\left(1+p_k\frac{B_{k(-)}}{B_{k(+)}}\right)}{\left(\frac{B_{k(-)}}{B_{k(+)}}+p_k\right)}\left(\frac{B_{k(-)}}{B_{k(+)}}\right)^2. \tag{6}$$

Solutions of this third-order equation with respect to $B_{k(-)}/B_{k(+)}$ can be used back in (5) to find the amplitude scalings and spectra.

At $k_\perp\rho_T<1$, to the leading order, $p_k\approx 0.75\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2$ and $q_k\approx 2$, which results in the amplitude ratio

$$\frac{B_{k(-)}}{B_{k(+)}}\approx\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\epsilon_{(-)}}{\epsilon_{(+)}}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{\epsilon_{(-)}}{\epsilon_{(+)}}+4\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2\right)\frac{\epsilon_{(-)}}{\epsilon_{(+)}}}\right). \tag{7}$$

Depending on $4\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2\gtrless\epsilon_{(-)}/\epsilon_{(+)}$, the former "MHD" range $k_\perp\rho_T<1$ splits further into the asymptotic MHD range controlled by counter-collisions, and kinetic WDR controlled by co-collisions.

In the asymptotic MHD range $k_\perp\rho_T<0.5\sqrt{\epsilon_{(-)}/\epsilon_{(+)}}$ the amplitude ratio (7) is $B_{k(-)}/B_{k(+)}\approx\epsilon_{(-)}/\epsilon_{(+)}$ and (5) gives the amplitude scaling $B_{k(\pm)}\sim k_\perp^{-1/3}$. The corresponding power spectrum is $P^{(\pm)}_{k\perp}=k_\perp^{-1}B^2_{k(\pm)}\sim k_\perp^{-5/3}$. These scalings reproduce those reported previously.

In WDR $0.5\sqrt{\epsilon_{(-)}/\epsilon_{(+)}}<k_\perp\rho_T<1$, controlled by co-collisions, the amplitude ratio is $k_\perp$-dependent:

$$\frac{B_{k(-)}}{B_{k(+)}}\approx\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{(-)}}{\epsilon_{(+)}}}\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right). \tag{8}$$

Then from (5) we obtain $B_{k(+)}\sim k_\perp^{-1}$ and spectrum

$$P^{(+)}_{k\perp}=k_\perp^{-1}B^2_{k(+)}\sim k_\perp^{-3}. \tag{9}$$

Subdominant amplitudes $B_{k(-)}\sim$ const and $P^{(-)}_{k\perp}\sim k_\perp^{-1}$.

In SDR $k_\perp\rho_T>1$ we have $p_k\approx 3$, $q_k\approx\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2$, then $B_{k(\pm)}\sim k_\perp^{-2/3}$ and $P^{(\pm)}_{k\perp}\sim k_\perp^{-7/3}$ in both components.

Evolution of the parallel wavenumbers. In the asymptotic MHD model by Lithwick et al. (2007) $k_{z(+)}\approx k_{z(-)}\sim k_\perp^{2/3}$. In WDR evolution of (+) waves becomes independent on (-) waves and the linear decorrelation rate is $\gamma^{\mathrm{L}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\sim\omega^{\mathrm{dis}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}$, where $\omega^{\mathrm{dis}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\approx 0.5k_zV_A\left(k_\perp\rho_T\right)^2$ is the dispersive part of frequency. The parallel wavenumber scaling $k_{z(+)}\approx$ const follows from the critical balance $\gamma^{\mathrm{L}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\sim\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}$. Evolution of parallel scales is thus suppressed in WDR.

Weak turbulence. Steepest spectra are formed by co-collisions in the weak turbulence. Using corresponding cascade rate $\gamma^{\mathrm{WTC}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\sim\left(\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}/\omega^{\mathrm{dis}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}\right)\gamma^{\mathrm{NL}}_{k\uparrow\uparrow}$ we find spectra $P_{k+}\sim k_\perp^{-4}$ ($\sim k_\perp^{-2.5}$) formed in WDR (SDR) by direct cascades of enstrophy (energy). These spectra were reported by Voitenko (1998b) (note that our power spectra P_k are related to the W_k spectra by Voitenko as $P_k\sim k_\perp W_k$). Galtier & Meyrand (2015) argued that SDR spectra might be even steeper than $\sim k_\perp^{-2.5}$.

3.2. *Non-universal spectra*

Since WDR is narrow, one order or less in the solar wind, the asymptotic spectrum $\sim k_\perp^{-3}$ can hardly set up. Instead, variable spectra with indexes approaching -3 are expected in WDR. This behavior is observed in Fig. 1 where spectra are plotted using (6) and (5), i.e. without taking asymptotic limits. The spectral indexes

in WDR vary, $\gtrsim -3$, such that steeper spectra follow larger imbalances $\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)}$.



FIG. 1.— Spectra of the dominant (+) component of the strong Alfvenic turbulence for different imbalance ratios $\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)}$. Perpendicular wavenumber $k_\perp$ is normalized by ρ_T, spectral powers are normalized to the same level in MHD limit.

Spectrum of (-) waves in WDR is much shallower, $\sim k_\perp^{-1}$, which leads to a convergence of (+) and (-) spectra. Such a pinning effect is seen in Fig. 2.



FIG. 2.— Spectra of the dominant (+) and sub-dominant (-) components of the strong turbulence for two imbalance ratios, $\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)} = 10$ (dashed curves) and 100 (solid curves). The pinning effect is stronger for larger imbalance.

The imbalance in terms of magnetic amplitudes is shown in Fig. 3. The amplitude ratio decreases from $B_{k(+)}/B_{k(-)} = \epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)}$ in the asymptotic MHD range to $B_{k(+)}/B_{k(-)} = \sqrt{\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)}}$ in the asymtotic kinetic range $k_\perp \gg \rho_i^{-1}$. The actual drop of the amplitude ratio is larger than the factor $\sqrt{\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)}}$ expected from the contrast between the MHD and kinetic scalings because co-collisions modify spectral transport also before $k_{\perp *}$ and after ρ_i^{-1}. Say, if the original imbalance in the asymptotic MHD range is 30, then in the asymptotic kinetic range above $k_{\perp *}$ it drops to about 4, as is seen in Fig. 3 (upper curve).

The WDR spectra are subject to further steepening by intermittency (Boldyrev & Peresz 2012, Zhao et al. 2016). Modifications introduced by intermittency can be cast in the form $P_k \to \tilde{P}_k \sim k_\perp^{-\alpha/3} P_k$, where $\alpha = 1$ for sheet-like and $\alpha = 2$ for tube-like fluctuations (Zhao et al. 2016). The strong WDR spectrum $P_k \sim k_\perp^{-3}$ can therefore steepen up to $\tilde{P}_k \sim k_\perp^{-3.7}$, which is close to



FIG. 3.— Ratio of (+)/(-) magnetic amplitudes for three imbalance ratios, $\epsilon_{(+)}/\epsilon_{(-)} = 30$, 10, and 3 from top to bottom. The amplitude ratio decreases significantly in WDR.

the upper boundary of the interval of measured spectral indexes [-2,-4] (Leamon et al. 1999, Smith et al. 2006). The steepest spectra $\sim k_\perp^{-4}$ to $\sim k_\perp^{-4.5}$ observed by Sahraoui et al. (2010) can be formed by co-collisions in the weakly turbulent regime.

4. DISCUSSION

Several recent observations can be explained by co-collisions triggered by imbalance. Bruno et al. (2014) and Bruno & Telloni (2015) have revealed that the ion-scale spectra are systematically steeper in the faster solar winds and suggested it may be caused by Alfvénicity, i.e. imbalance. Our theory supports this suggestion and explains why steeper spectra follow larger imbalances. Chen et al. (2014) found that at low β the spectral break shifts to scales larger than ρ_i, which can be attributed to co-collisions reducing $k_{\perp *}$ below $1/\rho_i$. Spectral trends in Fig. 2(a) by Chen et al. (2014) (and in Fig. 1(b) by Wicks et al. 2011) agree with our Figs. 1 and 2, and WDR properties 1–6 (see below). Markovskii et al. (2007) argued that the break wavenumber decreases with increasing amplitude at break, which again may be caused by the turbulence imbalance (it is usually larger at larger amplitudes). These observations are compatible with our theoretical predictions, but they did not use direct measurements of the turbulence imbalance. We are not aware of such dedicated observations so far.

Podesta et al. (2010) have shown that the cumulative effect of Landau damping at every cascade step prevents cascade extending far beyond the ion gyroradius scale. This and other kinetic damping effects were widely discussed as possible mechanisms absorbing turbulent cascades (Leamon et al. 1999, Voitenko & Goossens 2004, Wu & Yang 2007, Chandran et al., 2010, Maneva et al. 2013, Nariyuki et al. 2014, Cranmer 2014, Passot & Sulem 2015, and references therein). Nevertheless, the nearly universal power-law turbulent spectra $\sim k_\perp^{-2.8\pm0.3}$ extend in SDR up to electron gyroscale (Alexandrova et al. 2013, and references therein). Slight deviations from theoretical spectra ($\sim k_\perp^{-7/3}$ / $\sim k_\perp^{-2.5}$ in the strong / weak turbulence) can be attributed to intermittency (Boldyrev et al. 2012) and damping (Passot & Sulem 2015). Zhao et al. (2016) argued that damping modifies the spectral index by 0.1 only.

These observations suggest that the damping is not so strong as thought before. The reason can be particles' feedback via quasi-linear diffusion (e.g. Pierrard

& Voitenko 2013) reducing velocity-space gradients and hence damping (Voitenko & Goossens 2006). Clear signatures of quasi-linear plateaus in the solar-wind velocity distributions have been demonstrated recently by He et al. (2015), in which case estimations based on Maxwellian velocity distributions (Leamon et al. (1999), Podesta et al. (2010), and many others) are exaggerated and inapplicable. The actual damping is not easy to evaluate as the detailed knowledge of the velocity distributions is required in every particular case. We thus focused on nonlinear dynamics ignoring the linear damping $\gamma_k^{\rm L}$ as compared to $\gamma_k^{\rm NL}$ (which seems also natural in view of the usual ordering $\gamma_k^{\rm L} \ll \omega_k \sim \gamma_k^{\rm NL}$ in the critically balanced turbulence).

Non-universal spectra $\sim k_\perp^{-2}$ to $\sim k_\perp^{-4}$ observed in WDR (Leamon et al. 1999, Smith et al. 2007, Sahraoui et al. 2010) are much steeper than the theoretical spectrum $\sim k_\perp^{-5/3}$ formed by counter-collisions. Both the spectral steepening and non-universality in WDR are much larger than in SDR and can hardly be caused by intermittency or damping without significant modification of nonlinear interactions. Our theoretical results uphold the dominant role of the nonlinear interactions also in WDR, particularly due to their strengthening by co-collisions.

Here we investigated kinetic transition from imbalanced MHD turbulence described by Litwick et al. (2007). Transition from MHD turbulence described by Beresnyak and Lazaryan (2008) can be constructed similarly but is more cumbersome and will be studied separately. Here we only note that the cascade rate by Beresnyak & Lazaryan is reduced as compared to (3), which should reduce $k_{\perp *}$ and steepen spectra above it.

5. SUMMARY

We found a new dynamical range of the strong Alfvénic turbulence formed by co-collisions at sub-ion wavenumbers. Its main properties are:

1. The MHD-kinetic transition and spectral break occur at $k_{\perp *}$ (4). Counter-collisions still dominate below $k_{\perp *}$, but above $k_{\perp *}$ co-collisions become dominant and establish weakly dispersive turbulent range (WDR) $k_{\perp *} < k_\perp < 1/\rho_i$.

2. Spectral transport in WDR is accelerated and spectra are steep and non-universal. The spectral index vary from -2 to -4 depending on the turbulence imbalance, strength, and intermittency. Steeper spectra follow larger imbalances, stronger intermittency, or weaker turbulence.

3. Magnetic amplitude ratio $B_{k(+)}/B_{k(-)}$ is not scale-invariant in WDR decreasing from ϵ_+/ϵ_- to $\sqrt{\epsilon_+/\epsilon_-}$.

4. Dominant and sub-dominant spectra converge exhibiting a pinning effect in WDR.

5. Evolution of the parallel wavenumber and frequency slows down in WDR and wavenumber anisotropy grows faster.

6. WDR spectra are steeper than nearby MHD and SDR spectra, which results in a specific double-kink spectral pattern often observed at ion kinetic scales.

This research was supported by the Belgian Science Policy Office (through Prodex/Cluster PEA 90316 and IAP Programme project P7/08 CHARM). Some results of this paper were presented at the THESOW Conference (20-26 September 2015, Cargese, France) .

REFERENCES

Alexandrova, O.; Chen, C. H. K.; Sorriso-Valvo, L.; Horbury, T. S.; Bale, S. D. 2013, Space Sci. Rev., 178, 101.
Beresnyak, A., & Lazarian, A. 2010, ApJ, 754, 92.
Boldyrev, S., & Perez, J. C. 2012, ApJL, 758, L44.
Boldyrev, S., Chen, C. H. K., Xia, Q., & Zhdankin, V. 2015, ApJ, 806, 238.
Bruno, R., Trenchi, L., & Telloni, D. 2014, ApJL, 793, L15.
Bruno, R. & Telloni, D. 2015, ApJL, 811, L17.
Chandran, B. D. G.; Li, B.; Rogers, B. N.; Quataert, E., and Germaschewski, K. 2010, ApJ, 720, 503.
Chen, C. H. K.; Leung, L.; Boldyrev, S.; Maruca, B. A.; Bale, S. D. 2014, GRL, 41, 8081.
Cranmer, S. R. 2014, ApJS, 213, 16.
Galtier, S. & Meyrand, R. 2015, JPlPh, 81, 325810106.
Gogoberidze, G. 2007, PhPl, 14, 022304.
Goldreich, P., & Sridhar, S. 1995, ApJ, 438, 763.
Hasegawa, A., & Chen, L. 1976, PhFl, 19, 1924.
He, J.; Tu, C.; Marsch, E.; Yao, S. 2012, ApJ, 745, L8.
He, J.; Wang, L.; Tu, C.; Marsch, E.; Zong, Q. 2015, ApJL, 800, L31.
Howes, G. G., & Nielson, K. D. 2013, Phys. Plasmas, 20, 072302.
Kiyani, K. H.; Chapman, S. C.; Khotyaintsev, Yu. V.; Dunlop, M. W.; & Sahraoui, F. 2009, PhRvL, 103, 075006.
Leamon, R. J.; Smith, C.W.; Ness, N. F., & Wong, H. K. 1999, JGR, 104, 22331.
Lithwick, Y., Goldreich, P., & Sridhar, S. 2007, ApJ, 655, 269.
MacBride, B. T., & Smith, C. W. 2008, ApJ, 679, 1644.
Maneva, Y. G.; Vinas, A. F., Moya, P. S., Wicks, R. T., & Poedts, S. 2015, ApJ, 814, 33.
Markovskii, S. A., Vasquez, B. J., & Smith, C. W. 2008, ApJ, 675, 1576.
Moya, P. S.; Pinto, V. A.; Vinas, A. F.; Sibeck, D. G.; Kurth, W. S.; Hospodarsky, G. B.; Wygant, J. R. 2015, JGRA, 120, 5504.
Nariyuki, Y.; Hada, T.; Tsubouchi, K. 2014, ApJ, 793, 138.
Passot, T., & Sulem, P. L. 2015, ApJL, 812, L37.
Pierrard, V. & Voitenko, Y. 2013, SoPh, 288, 355.
Podesta, J. J. 2013, SoPh, 286, 529.
Podesta, J. J.; Borovsky, J. E., & Gary, S. P. 2010, ApJ, 712, 685.
Roberts, O. W., Li, X., & Jeska, L. 2015, ApJ, 802, 2.
Sahraoui, F.; Goldstein, M. L.; Belmont, G.; Canu, P., and Rezeau, L. 2010, PhRvL, 105, 131101.
Schekochihin, A. A.; Cowley, S. C.; Dorland, W.; Hammett, G. W.; Howes, G. G.; Quataert, E., & Tatsuno, T. 2009, ApJS, 182, 310.
Smith, C. W.; Hamilton, K.; Vasquez, B. J., and Leamon, R. J. 2006, ApJL, 645, L85.
Stawarz, J. E., Ergun, R. E., & Goodrich, K. A. 2015, JGRA, 120, 1845.
Voitenko, Yu. M. 1998a, JPlPh, 60, 497.
Voitenko, Yu. M. 1998b, JPlPh, 60, 515.
Voitenko, Y. & M. Goossens 2004, NPGeo, 11, 535.
Voitenko, Y. & M. Goossens 2006, Space Sci. Rev., 122, 255.
Voitenko, Y. & De Keyser, J. 2011, NPGeo, 18, 587.
von Papen, M.; Saur, J.; Alexandrova, O. 2014, JGRA, 119, 2797.
Wicks, R. T., T. S. Horbury, C. H. K. Chen, and A. A. Schekochihin 2011, PhRvL, 106, 045001.
Wu, D. J. & Yang, L. 2007, ApJ, 659, 1693.
Yang, L.; Lee, L. C.; Chao, J. K.; Hsieh, W. C.; Luo, Q. Y.; Li, J. P.; Shi, J. K.; Wu, D. J. 2015, ApJ, 817, 178.
Zhao, J. S.; Wu, D. J.; Lu, J. Y. 2013, ApJ, 767, 109.
Zhao, J. S.; Voitenko, Y. M.; Wu, D. J.; Yu, M. Y. 2016, JGRA, 121, 5.